



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

CENTER FOR HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FIREARM TRAINING STANDARDS

for the

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

and

CALIFORNIA YOUTH AUTHORITY

Conducted for

**Commission on Correctional Peace Officer
Standards and Training**

William Vizzard, D.P.A., CSU Sacramento, Criminal Justice Division

Michael McCrystle, J.D., CSU Sacramento, Criminal Justice Division

With Assistance From:

Miki Vohryzek-Bolden, Ph.D., CSU Sacramento, Criminal Justice Division

Peggy Giannoni, Ph.D. (c), CSU Sacramento, Center for Health and Human Services

D. Kall Loper, Ph.D., CSU Sacramento, Criminal Justice Division

April 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Study Methodology	1
CURRENT CALIFORNIA PRACTICE	3
POST Mandates and Standards	3
California Department of Corrections Recruit Training	4
California Youth Authority Recruit/In-Service Training	5
Best Practices	5
National Survey	5
National Standards	6
Site Visit – FBI Academy	6
Legal Issues Related to Firearms Training	9
STUDY FINDINGS.....	13
Firearm Incidents – California Department of Corrections	13
Site Visits and Certified Range Officer Interviews - California Department of Corrections	13
Site Survey and Interviews – California Department of Corrections Basic Academy.....	17
Site Survey and Interviews - California Youth Authority.....	18
Certified Range Officers Survey - California Department of Corrections	18
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	20
Summary	20
Recommendations	21
CLOSING REMARKS	30
APPENDICES	
Appendix 1. California Department of Corrections Firearm Training Survey of Range Masters	35

Appendix 2. Results of Firearm Training Survey of Range Masters 37

Appendix 3. Results of Survey of State Correctional Agencies 41

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
Table 1.	POST Firearm Training Standards	4
Table 2.	Mini-14 Course of Fire	4
Table 3.	Number of Incidents For Each Staff Weapon Used by Year of Incident, January 1998 – June 2001	13
Table 4.	Firearm Training Recommendations	28

INTRODUCTION

California Penal Code Section 13601(a) requires the California Commission on Correctional Peace Officer Standards and Training (CPOST) to "develop, approve and monitor standards for selection and training of state correctional peace officers." Section 13601(b) states that, "CPOST may approve standards for a course in the carrying and use of firearms for correctional peace officers that is different from that prescribed pursuant to Penal Code Section 832." These firearm standards must reflect the unique circumstances presented within institutional settings.

CPOST contracted with California State University, Sacramento to conduct a review of current practices and standards for firearm training and certification of correctional peace officers in California and make recommendations for future minimum standards for training and certification. The focus was on recruit training and subsequent refresher training. A review of practices applicable only to parole agents, special agents or members of tactical teams employed by California correctional agencies was not the focus of our research. In addition, the report does not address certification for carrying firearms when a correctional peace officer is not on official duty.

Since all correctional peace officers must meet the minimum standards for certification by the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), the research focused solely on the additional firearm training and certification requirements that apply to correctional peace officers as a result of their duties within an institution. For purposes of this research, a firearm is defined as any device capable of expelling a projectile intended to produce lethal or non-lethal injury.

Study Methodology

Information relating to current practice and perceived firearm training needs was gathered using the following methods:

- Review of current California practice.
- Face-to-face interviews with certified range officers at five California Department of Corrections (CDC) institutions, one California Youth Authority (CYA) institution,

and the chief of firearms at the CDC academy using a standard interview tool (see Appendix 1 for interview guide).

- Telephone interviews with certified range officers at CDC institutions not visited using the same standard interview tool (see Appendix 2, Table A1 for a list of the institutions).
- Examination of training facilities at the CDC academy and six institutions. This included the examination of armed posts at the institutions, along with an evaluation of the potential for specific types of firearm use.
- Review of firearm incidents in CDC for a three-year period.
- Survey of other state correctional agencies for current practice (see Appendix 3, Table B1 for a list of states).
- Interview of key training personnel at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) regarding federal practice.

Researchers also reviewed current state and federal law in addition to applicable case law regarding both training mandates and liability implications derived from these training mandates.

CURRENT CALIFORNIA PRACTICE

POST Mandates and Standards

Correctional officers are peace officers within the meaning of Penal Code Section 832. This status is accorded them by virtue of Penal Code Section 830.5, which provides in part that:

The following persons are peace officers whose authority extends to any place in the state while engaged in the performance of the duties of their respective employment and for the purpose of carrying out the primary function of their employment or as required under Sections 8597, 8598, and 8517 of the Government Code. Except as specified in this section, these peace officers may carry firearms only if authorized and under those terms and conditions specified by their employing agency.

(b) a correctional officer employed by the Department of Corrections or any employee of the Department of the Youth Authority having custody of wards or the Inspector General of the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency or any internal affairs investigator under the authority of the Inspector General or any employee of the Department of Corrections designated by the Director of Corrections.....

California Penal Code Section 830.5 establishes standards for carrying firearms by parole agents, correctional peace officers and youth correctional peace officers. All officers authorized to carry firearms on or off duty must meet the requirements specified in Penal Code Section 832. The section requires satisfactory completion of an introductory training course specified by POST. These minimum training standards for the course of fire prescribed by Penal Code Section 832 as outlined in POST regulation 1081 (a) (1) is a firearms course of 24 hours. This training includes eight hours of classroom instruction on firearms safety, handgun familiarization, firearms care and cleaning, and firearms shooting principles. In addition to the required classroom training, an additional 15 hours of range training is mandated. A one-hour examination is also recommended.

Table 1. POST Firearm Training Standards

Stance	Rounds	Distance	Time
Hip Level	12	3 yards	30 seconds
Point Shoulder	12	7 yards	30 seconds
Sight	12	15 yards	45 seconds

Note: California Department of Corrections Field Agents must also adhere to these standards by law (PC 832).

The standards currently require training and qualification with a handgun, but do not require qualification with other firearms (see Table 1). There

are a total of 36 rounds fired in daylight conditions in three stages, with each stage separately timed. The officer uses duty ammunition or its equivalent and starts from a standing, holstered position. A manual, speed loader, or magazine reloading is required after every six rounds. A passing score is 29 ‘hits’ within the 7-ring. CPOST has not adopted requirements for correctional peace officers relating to the use of firearms beyond those required by POST.

California Department of Corrections Recruit Training

Recruit training as mandated by the Department of Corrections Operation Manual Chapter 3000, Subchapter 3200, Section 32010 (32010.92 – Compliance with qualification requirements) reflects compliance with Penal Code Section 832: “Every entry-level peace officer shall complete training required by Penal Code Section 832 prior to exercising peace officer powers.”

The principal firearms instructor at the CDC Basic Academy Facility in Galt, California stated that firearms training for recruits far exceed the minimum standards established by Penal Code Section 832. CDC recruits receive a minimum of 35 hours of range training, along with classroom instruction. In addition, training is provided on all weapons used by the Department of Corrections (no such requirement exists with Penal Code Section 832).

The Mini-14 training consists of a

Table 2. Mini-14 Course of Fire

Yards	Time	Rounds	Position
25	No limit	5	Point shoulder
	No limit	5	Kneeling
50	No limit	5	Point Shoulder
	No limit	5	Kneeling

minimum 25-round course of fire during the instruction phase, where all shots are fired from ground level (see Table 2). An examination of actual shootings (see later discussion of

firearm incident data) indicated that almost all rounds from the Mini-14 were fired from elevated positions.

Revolver training is also provided to recruits with a 36-round course of fire as well as a 20-round course of fire for the Remington Model 870 shotgun. Courses of fire utilizing the 37 mm and L-8 weapons, which are capable of launching a multitude of rounds, are also provided. In addition to the “hands-on” range training, the recruits receive considerable classroom instruction in all phases of the weapons as well as their utilization within the institutional setting.

California Youth Authority Recruit/In-Service Training

Interviews with personnel in the California Youth Authority revealed that correctional officers received no firearms training during the basic academy period. CYA provides a basic Penal Code Section 832 course for correctional peace officers who may have the authority to utilize firearms at a later date. The course does not provide additional training in the use of shotguns, rifles or gas guns.

Best Practices

The data that describes current best practices in firearms training were generated from three sources: 1) national survey; 2) a review of relevant state and national training documents; and 3) a site visit to the FBI academy.

National Survey

Correctional administrators in forty-nine states were sent a letter requesting a copy of their current regulations regarding recruit training and periodic certification for correctional officers in their state (see Appendix 3). Responses were received from 28 states (see Appendix 3, Table B1). In some cases, the responses were incomplete. However, the data indicate that 12 states have firearm certification standards that are equivalent to POST, though Colorado and Illinois indicated that peace officers, not correctional officers, are

certified (see Appendix 3, Table B2). Twenty states require annual qualification and one state requires biannual qualification.

Respondents also provided information on correctional officers' initial firearm qualification requirements (see Appendix 3, Table B3). Seventeen states require initial qualification on a handgun (i.e., service, .38, pistol, .40 and handgun), 11 states require qualification on a .223 rifle and seven other states indicated just rifle, 19 states require qualification on a shotgun, and three indicated requirements for 37 mm and one for the 38 mm.

National Standards

The standards as set by the International Association of Law Enforcement Firearms Instructors, Inc. (IALEFI) were reviewed in their publication "Firearms Training Standards for Law Enforcement Personnel." IALEFI recommends a minimum of 70 hours of actual instructional classroom, range and simulation training. The training includes the firing of a minimum of 1000-rounds of ammunition, and basic skills and tactical skills training. Basic skills training includes classroom presentations on legal justification for the use of deadly force, departmental firearms policy, and liability issues. Tactical skills training includes role-playing and decision making, retention and disarming, and shotgun practice. Anecdotal information obtained during site visits (see later discussion) indicate that CDC's firearms training requirements for new recruits come close to the IALEFI's recommended hours of training. However, the number of rounds recommended (1000) is not approached. IALEFI standards apply to training courses for handguns, shotgun and rifles. The IALEFI provides general guidance in the areas of courses of fire but does not prescribe specific courses of fire with respect to any of the weapons.

Site Visit – FBI Academy

A site visit was made to the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia. The Section Chief of the Firearms Training Unit provided a copy of the New Agents Firearms Training curriculum offered to newly appointed Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A new agent undergoing basic training fires over 3,700 rounds of handgun ammunition during the initial training (see box, following page). In addition to firing the handgun, new agents fire

approximately 132 shotgun rounds as well as 200-rounds of carbine rifle rounds. The training is provided during 116 hours of range time. The number of rounds fired as well as the hours spent on the range by the FBI recruits far exceeds any other agencies observed by the investigators.

The FBI training utilizes technology that has been integrated into its basic firearms training program. They have developed a program known as the Marksmanship Diagnosis System (MDS) that the visiting investigator was allowed to try in real time. This system is not a role playing, scenario-type unit; it provides the mechanical skills necessary for basic shooting. MDS employs a firearms training video system. The system allows the instructor to observe the exact sight picture seen by the student. This is accomplished by having the student wear a specially constructed pair of glasses containing two miniature video screens (one for each eye) and a miniature camera. The

student, wearing the glasses, takes aim via the two miniature video screens and this sight picture is transmitted to a nearby TV monitor. The instructor, by viewing the TV monitor, is in essence "seeing" exactly what the student sees.

NEW AGENTS FBI FIREARMS TRAINING

New Agents at the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia are afforded training in handgun, shotgun and automatic shoulder weapons. During the course of their training, which is 16 weeks in length, the student is required to fire over 3500 rounds utilizing a Glock Model 22 or 23 semi-automatic pistol. In addition, over 250 rounds are fired utilizing the Remington Model 870 shotgun. Both buckshot and rifled slug are fired in the shotgun. Approximately 300 rounds of .10 mm ammunition are fired through the Heckler and Koch MP5/10 submachine gun.

The 80 hours of firearms training on stationary or turning targets primarily covers the basic fundamentals associated with shooting. Twenty-five hours of firearms training is offered on combat style targets including the Firearms Training System (FATS) depicting actual arrest scenarios and incorporating the FBI's deadly force policy.

The student is required to qualify with the pistol, shotgun and submachine gun during the 8th and 9th weeks of training. A minimum score of 80 percent is required for qualification with each weapon. Pistol qualification requires 80 percent on two of three pistol qualification courses. Shotgun and submachine gun qualifications require a minimum score of 80 percent on one of two qualification courses of fire. During the 15th week, the pistol and shotgun are fired for final qualification. Students must also demonstrate proficiency on combat courses and the FATS (a pass/fail system applies on those courses).

Students who fail in any of these courses are afforded remedial training. Remedial training consists of two scheduled 2-hour sessions held prior to the 8th week qualification. Those students who do not qualify after a qualification session are assigned to a "fast track" recycle program. This program consists of the same number of firearms training sessions received prior to the qualification, compressed into a period not to exceed two weeks. Students who requalify are integrated into another new agent's class at the same level. Failure to qualify after this remediation results in dismissal. Only one recycle per weapon type is allowed.

MDS is also capable of showing on another video monitor the strike of each bullet as the student fires the weapon. Utilizing slow motion and freeze-frame components, the instructor is able to demonstrate to the student the placement of the bullet in relation to the sight picture at the time the weapon is fired.

A second technological advancement was yet another electronic device, a remote trigger system, to demonstrate correct trigger control to the student. This small device is affixed to the trigger and allows the instructor to actuate the trigger as the student holds the weapon. Thus, the student is able to appreciate the steady, non-jerking control of the trigger so necessary to the mastery of basic marksmanship skills.

A third device, the trigger deflection sensor, was developed to teach correct "uptake" of trigger slack, uniform pressure to move the trigger to a hammer fall that "surprises," and a quick release of pressure to reset the trigger. This is accomplished with the use of a sensor attached to the weapon which transmits trigger movements to a TV screen and plots, in graphical form, the student's pressure on the trigger both before, at the time of, and after a shot has been fired.

During the past year, over 1,800 new agents have undergone firearms training using the MDS, and only 18 were unable to qualify. These data suggested to the FBI section chief that this diagnosis system increased the number of recruits who qualified and were certified during their firearms training.

Another firearms training system is Range 2000, a fully interactive, multimedia tool developed by IES Interactive Training of Littleton, Colorado and adopted by CDC. The computer-driven interactive scenarios mirror the kinds of conflict situations custody personnel and parole agents are likely to encounter on the job. The focus is on building and reinforcing the fundamental competencies, professionalism, and performance of correctional peace officers. CDC developed several of its own individual scenarios to be incorporated into the system.

Training on the Range 2000 system involves different digital videotaped conflict situations controlled via a personal computer by a simulator operator. The one-to-three minute scenarios, which are projected life-size onto a seven-foot by 10-foot screen, include situations such as an inmate who disrupts a chow line, an argument between an inmate and a canteen clerk, and an inmate's girlfriend who pulls a gun on transport officers.

The trainee is directed to face the screen and respond to the on-screen situation as it unfolds. Based on the trainee's reactions, the operator can select a peaceful resolution to the scenario or have it escalate to the point where another level of force (i.e., lethal or less-than-lethal) is necessary. Each of the department's less-lethal and lethal devices can interact with the Range 2000 simulator via an imbedded infrared laser.

Researchers observed the Range 2000 during a short demonstration. Scenario-based training requiring judgmental decisions by officers is very important in any training program and the Range 2000 program appeared to be an outstanding method of providing this training. Investigators also observed tactical training with the use of a product named "Simunitions". Simunitions allows the use of non-lethal ammunition that is ballistically accurate for short distances and marks an individual upon impact. The overall benefit of any simulation training is that it can be tailored to a specific environment, which allows for a more realistic training approach.

Legal Issues Related to Firearms Training

Potential liability emanating from mandated standards would most likely come in the form of a lawsuit challenging the adequacy of these mandated standards of training. Many suits of this type have been filed in the past although none were located challenging a state mandated program. They are generally found in the "failure to train" context. In order to succeed in a "failure to train" lawsuit, the plaintiff must establish that the defendant fell below some accepted standard and as a result of this "breach," the plaintiff sustained some measurable damages.

Our research revealed no suits challenging the sufficiency of mandated training standards by an agency equivalent to CPOST. Several lawsuits were noted that allege a failure to train.

These cases for the most part arise out of incidents involving free persons and law enforcement officers. Accordingly, most cases are couched in a deprivation of 4th Amendment, U.S. Constitution rights. Suits by an inmate of a similar nature would necessarily arise in the context of a deprivation of the cruel and unusual provisions of the 8th Amendment, U.S. Constitution. While none were found, it is assumed the law would be very similar to cases already decided on similar issues involving deprivation of 4th Amendment rights.

In one such suit of this type (*Popow v. City of Margate*, 476 F. Supp. 1237, D. N. J., 1979), the victim of a police firearms-related accident brought a suit against the City of Margate, New Jersey that employed the officer involved in the accident. The officer was chasing a suspect through a residential neighborhood and fired his weapon at a fleeing suspect. His shot went awry, hitting an innocent civilian. In the U. S. District Court's decision denying the defendant's motion for summary judgment, the court provided some helpful guidelines.

In summary, the court reviewed the circumstances involved in the accident and noted that no training in the actual conditions encountered by the officer had been provided. Trainees were not provided the opportunity, for example, to shoot at moving targets, in low light level conditions, and other similar conditions. It was the opinion of the court that failure to provide training in conditions that the officer might likely encounter could be negligent. These guidelines have universal application for all firearms training programs.

The most common lawsuit challenging the adequacy of training programs are filed under the statutory provisions of Title 42, Section 1983, United States Code. A Section 1983 lawsuit is not available against CPOST because it cannot be brought against a state entity. It is available to test the adequacy of an individual institution's training programs, however, and may name a warden or other institution head as the defendant. This does not mean that CPOST is insulated from a lawsuit.

Under general tort theory, a plaintiff could bring suit challenging the adequacy of firearms standards mandated by CPOST. The likelihood of proving the inadequacy of a training

standard as being the proximate cause of damages incurred seems almost negligible in light of the fact no successful lawsuit challenging the adequacy of Penal Code Section 832 could be located. Numerous Section 1983 lawsuits have been filed, however, against the Director of the Department of Corrections, wardens of institutions, as well as correctional officers.

A landmark case involving "1983" suits regarding municipal liability was decided by the United States Supreme Court in 1978. This case, *Monell v. City of New York Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 56 L.Ed. 2d 611 (1978), for the first time ruled that a municipality could be sued under Section 1983 when a policy or practice of the agency causes the constitutional violation. The Court reversed their earlier decision in the 1961 case of *Monroe v. Pape*, 365 U.S. 167.

The leading United States Supreme Court case involving failure to train is *City of Canton, Ohio v. Harris*, 1109 S.Ct. 1197, 103 L.Ed. 2d 412, 57 U.S.L.W. 4270 (1989). While not involving a failure to train with respect to firearms, the general rule of law is instructive. In this case a citizen was arrested and transported to the police station for processing. The citizen fell several times at the police station and was incoherent. No medical attention was called for by the police. The citizen was released after one hour and friends transported her to the hospital. She was diagnosed as suffering from severe emotional ailments. She was hospitalized for one week and required outpatient care for one year. She sued the city for failure to provide medical care while in custody.

The Court in rendering its decision first examined the question of whether the injuries suffered by the plaintiff were the result of a policy or custom of the police department. The city's policy provided that, "the jailer shall have a person needing medical care taken to a hospital for medical treatment, with permission of his supervisor." This was not done in this case. The Court stated, "We hold today that the inadequacy of police training may serve as the basis for 1983 liability only where the failure to train amounts to a deliberate indifference to the rights of persons with whom the police come into contact," 489 U.S. 378 at 389 (1989). Most instructive with respect to the establishment of training standards is the following quote from the Court: "In resolving the issue of a city's liability, the focus must be

on the adequacy of the training program in relation to the tasks the particular officers must perform," 489 U.S. 378 at 390.

The elements of a failure to train lawsuit may be viewed in light of pre-written, or "model" jury instructions, which clearly and succinctly state the law in a specific case. The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals model jury instructions in the area of failure to train are as follows:

On the plaintiff's claim for failure to train, the plaintiff has the burden of proving each of the following by a preponderance of the evidence:

1. The [city's] [county's] training program was not adequate to train its [officers] [employees] to respond properly to the usual and recurring situations with which they must deal;
2. The [city] [county] was deliberately indifferent to the need to train its [officers] [employees] adequately; and
3. The failure to provide proper training was the [proximate] [legal] cause of the deprivation of the plaintiff's rights protected by the Constitution [or laws] of the United States.

(Section 11.3.4 Municipal Liability-Failure to Train-Elements and Burden of Proof)

While it is noted CPOST is not a "municipality" and thus would not be an appropriate party to a "1983" lawsuit (indeed a state may NOT be a party defendant to a 1983 suit, see *Will v. Michigan Department of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58 (1989)), the general principles established in the suits described above are informative. They provide, in the opinion of the researchers, excellent guidance for the establishment of a meaningful standard.

STUDY FINDINGS

Firearm Incidents California Department of Corrections

CDC provided summary data on all firearm incidents occurring during calendar years 1998 through June 1, 2001, in which staff intentionally fired a rifle, handgun or shotgun within an institution (see Table 3). Although unable to obtain exact information on the mechanics of each shooting from CDC

records, general

descriptions from

interviews of the range

personnel were obtained.

With the exception of the

use of 37/40mm weapons,

shooting events were very

rare. Between January

1998 and July 2001, officers fired warning shots from rifles on 127 occasions and rifle shots for effect on 17 occasions.

Table 3. Number of Incidents For Each Staff Weapon Used by Year of Incident, January 1998 – June 2001

Type of incident	1998	1999	2000	2001
Mini-14 for effect	9	4	3	1
Mini-14 for warning	83	23	18	3
37mm used**	884	574	625	298
40mm used**	0	0	0	5
Shotgun	1	0	0	0
Handgun	0	1	0	0

** Excluding the CN Gas/Triple chaser grenade.

The data within the columns are not mutually exclusive.

Source: Data Analysis Unit, Estimates and Statistical Analysis Section, Offender Information Services Branch

These statistics provide a somewhat skewed view of current operations in light of current procedures. Warning shots declined 75 percent between 1998 and 1999. Only 3 warning shots were fired in the first six months of 2001. Likewise, shots for effect fell from nine in 1998 to four in 1999 and only one in the first half of 2001. Shotguns and handguns were used on only one occasion each during this period. Neither was used in 2000 or 2001. The 37/40mm firearms were used on 2381 occasions to fire non-lethal projectiles during this period but produced only one potentially serious injury and no fatal injuries.

Site Visits and Certified Range Officer Interviews California Department of Corrections

Site visits were conducted at the following institutions: California State Prison, Sacramento; California State Prison, Corcoran; Folsom State Prison; Mule Creek State Prison; and Pelican

Bay State Prison. These institutions were selected to assure a comprehensive sample of structural configurations. The architectural designs of the institutions include five types: the old style that include cell block, telephone and other types of structural design; and the new 270 and 180 design that are based on the view from the control booth.

At each location, firearms training staff were interviewed, and tours were conducted of the institutions with special attention to all armed posts and firearm ranges. The training staff were asked about the nature and adequacy of current training, suitability of facilities, nature of past shootings, potential for future firearm usage, administrative procedures to assure conformity with firearm training regulations, and need for modification of existing procedures. Overall, interviews with the range officers revealed a high level of training and motivation.

On most topics, respondents expressed a high degree of concurrence. The firearms staff agreed that most shootings involved the use of the 37/40mm weapons firing non-lethal projectiles. The firearm incident data described earlier confirm this observation. They also agreed that most potentially fatal shootings would involve the use of the Mini-14 rifle from an armed post. Officers in these posts can fire either into an open exercise yard or some interior portion of the institution, depending upon design. In virtually all cases, the officer would fire from an elevated position with the benefit of good lighting. Although some areas covered by armed posts are in excess of 100 yards, current shooting policy normally precludes shooting over 100 yards because the officer could not effectively identify an appropriate threat to a staff member or inmate.

Although handguns and shotguns are issued to officers for transportation and escape details, no person interviewed could cite an incident where these weapons were fired on those details. Handguns are also issued to some officers in armed posts for self-protection, where inmates might somehow gain access to the area. However, respondents offered no instances where these weapons were fired.

Interviewees stated that shootings from armed posts declined for several years and have significantly declined since reinterpretation of the CDC shooting policy in April 1999. Department administrators indicate however, that while a use of force lesson plan was prepared in April 1999 and revised again in July 2000, the policy itself has been in effect for years.

Although all cadets must qualify with the handgun, shotgun and rifle to graduate from the CDC basic academy, they only fire the 37/40mm for familiarization. Thereafter, every officer must re-qualify yearly with the handgun and the rifle and demonstrate familiarization with the shotgun and the 37/40mm. Although the academy shotgun course requires a minimum number of hits to qualify, the re-qualification course does not require a qualifying score and constitutes only a familiarization. The department is converting from older 37mm, smooth bore gas guns to newer rifled 40mm weapons. Both models are used to fire chemical agents and non-lethal impact rounds.

Establishing a qualification course for the 37/40 mm weapon has been precluded by two factors. First, the ammunition is very expensive, with costs about \$14 per round. New reloadable, indirect fire ammunition can be fired for \$1 per round but takes time to reload the rounds. Direct fire ammunition for the 40mm costs in excess of \$14 per round to reload. Thus, officers normally fire only one round per year.

Second, the 37mm's smooth bore limits its accuracy. Safety regulations require officers to fire impact munitions from the 37mm at the ground or floor and bounce them into a target, further limiting the potential accuracy of the weapon. Such limited accuracy virtually precludes establishing a qualification course based on the number of hits scored. The new 40mm round has a direct fire capability and much greater accuracy. Once in universal use, this will allow a course of fire that includes a minimum score for qualification. However, the cost of ammunition will likely preclude implementing a course of fire in which officers expend multiple rounds of ammunition on a regular basis.

Although the vast majority of shootings involve the use of non-lethal weapons, the trainers interviewed expressed less concern about 37/40mm training than the training related to lethal firearms. We concluded that their concern was related to the low potential for serious injury or death from the use of non-lethal weapons. A CDC training staff person could cite only one incident that resulted in a person being hospitalized from 37 or 40mm fire during the past three years. The inmate involved required overnight observation and treatment.

Staff expressed concern at only one facility about the nature of the shotgun course. Almost all those interviewed expressed some concern regarding the adequacy of rifle and handgun training. The concerns were centered on the lack of training options (e.g., use of moving targets, variation in targets, moving before shooting). All officers must fire all four weapons yearly and qualify with the rifle and handgun. Officers working armed posts must qualify quarterly with any weapon they have available at their post. No training is provided beyond routine qualification and the preparatory safety briefing and reorientation. The trainers concurred that this approach minimizes the opportunity for developing any advanced skill or competency for those with little firearm usage and experience.

Some respondents also expressed concern that such training failed to incorporate current knowledge regarding the introduction of stress and decision making into firearm training. Those interviewed expressed divided opinions on the adequacy of the current, basic academy firearm training. Some cited examples of new officers arriving from the academy with inadequate skill to qualify without remedial training. Others stated that all new officers met the minimum standard. It appears, however, that new officers rarely fail to meet minimum qualification standards.

All firearms training personnel were queried regarding procedures for ensuring that all officers qualified annually and that the officers assigned to armed posts qualified quarterly on appropriate weapons. All officers are issued a qualification card to document their training and maintain currency. Respondents agreed that requiring officers to track their own qualification requirements was an effective system. The department does not currently have an automated system to track qualification and detect a failure to qualify. In theory, an

officer might fail to attend the range during a required quarter without detection, but this does not seem to occur.

What does occur, according to all interviewed, is the assignment of a person to an armed post or armed transportation detail who did not meet quarterly qualifications. The assignment results from unforeseen personnel shortages due to illness or other unscheduled events. Although this does not appear to be a routine practice, all those interviewed were aware of multiple instances of such substitutions.

Site Survey and Interviews California Department of Corrections Basic Academy

The researchers visited the CDC academy and interviewed the armory lieutenant and chief firearm trainer. Although the academy has adequate facilities for classroom training, it lacks a firearm range. As a result, cadets must travel to the Sacramento Valley shooting center for their actual range training. The armory lieutenant estimated that about 15 of the allotted 40 hours of range training are consumed by travel and range set up and disassembly. The range used does not allow for any advanced shooting techniques (moving targets, cover and movement drills, shoot houses) nor does the academy teach these. The academy lacks the sort of cutting edge equipment found at the FBI academy where instructors can monitor student sight picture, grip or trigger pull. The lack of a range on the academy facility does have an impact on the quality of firearm training, if only by decreasing the range time available.

In spite of the lack of a range and cutting edge technical aids at the academy, CDC has an impressive firearm training program. They have a large cadre of well-trained range officers, whom they train and certify at the CDC academy.

The researchers reviewed the lesson plans for both new officer and range officer training. Learning objectives and evaluation procedures are clearly delineated. Assessment standards are clear and rationally related to the learning objectives. The lesson plans themselves are very detailed and incorporate lecture, demonstration, and hands-on learning.

The overall quality of the CDC program appears the equal of any correctional agency in the country.

Site Survey and Interviews California Youth Authority

One site survey of a representative CYA institution was conducted at the Preston Youth Correctional Facility. CYA policy does not authorize armed posts within its institutions, thus negating the need for numerous site visits. CYA has no range facilities and does not allow lethal weapons within their institutions. The senior firearm instructor for CYA, the training officer at Preston Youth Correctional Facility, and the Chief of Security Operations were interviewed. CYA allows no firearm other than the 37mm weapon inside its facilities. All officers receive orientation on this firearm in the academy and annually thereafter, but they fire no practice rounds. The only non-chemical projectile fired by CYA from the 37mm is the multiple foam-baton round. This has been used only at one institution and has resulted in no serious injuries. Even at this one institution, these rounds have been used only rarely. CYA is moving away from even occasional use of the baton round in favor of the use of pepper ball launchers, which do not qualify as firearms for the purpose of this study.

Certified Range Officers Survey California Department of Corrections

In addition to the in-depth personal interviews conducted with firearms trainers during institutional visits, the researchers conducted telephone interviews with the range masters from each of the 33 CDC institutions using a standard interview form (see Appendix 1). The survey revealed that all but one institution, California Men's Colony (CMC), have either their own firearms range or share a range with an adjacent correctional institution or other agency, such as a police department (see Appendix 2, Table A2).

All 23 CDC ranges have the capacity for shooting rifles at 100 yards, and only six (serving 11 institutions) lack elevated platforms at the 100 yard line (see Appendix 2, Table A2). All the institutions have access to a range and most have ranges for their exclusive or primary use. Examination of the ranges at several facilities revealed them to be well constructed and

in good repair. Range capacity varies, with CMC able to accommodate only seven shooters at one time and five other institutions able to accommodate up to 20 shooters at a time on rifle and handgun (Appendix 2, Table A3). All the ranges have 100-yard rifle capability as well as handgun and shotgun capability.

Although some ranges have parallel facilities for rifle and handgun, which can also be used for 37/40 mm or shotgun qualification, the limited number of range staff would normally not allow concurrent use of two ranges simultaneously. The number of qualified range personnel varied at the time of the survey from five to 20 per institution (see Appendix 2, Table A4).

The CDC Academy has no range and contracts out for range facilities. All CDC institutions qualify personnel during a 27- or 28-day training cycle every quarter. Ranges are not usually available for voluntary training at other times. Over half (18) of the range masters surveyed stated that new recruits from the academy possess the minimum firearm skill required, while a small minority expressed concern about the new cadets firearm proficiency. Both the survey of range masters and the face-to-face interviews confirm that the quality of firearms training in the academy has improved over the past few years, and that only a very few academy graduates, usually those with no prior firearm exposure, may be deficient or marginal.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The data gleaned from the interviews of firearms training staff and range masters, physical examination of institutions, visit to the FBI academy, and a review of various written material on firearms training suggest that the California Department of Corrections has firearms training curricula and training practices that far exceed that available in other states around the country.

The CDC courses of fire and training meet or exceed the national standard for such training and facilitate training and re-qualifying large numbers of officers. The quarterly re-certification standard and the department mechanisms for assuring its implementation balance the need for training with the cost and logistical burdens generated by so many personnel. While the researchers found that the current program fails to develop expert marksmen and to incorporate the latest innovations for incorporating stress and decision making into actual firearm training, it does assure a minimum level of competency for virtually all officers.

CDC appears to be at the forefront among correctional agencies in firearm training. In addition, numerous interviews revealed that persons who experience difficulty with firearm usage do not volunteer for armed posts. Thus, a sort of informal self-selection reduces any potential impact of their performance.

Our research indicated that youth correctional officers do not require firearms training as a part of their basic recruit training, with the exception of an introduction to the 37mm weapon. The current CYA training standards for the use of the 37mm weapon are adequate. The current training focuses largely on policy and handling familiarity. CYA is not authorized to use direct fire projectiles and the 37mm has only marginal accuracy. Thus, any effort to develop training focused on improved firing skill will meet with little success.

Recommendations

Any policy decisions relating to firearm training for correctional peace officers must recognize the disparate nature of the jobs performed by the two classes of officers employed in institutions. Because the mission and firearm policies of CDC and CYA differ significantly, the training needs of their respective officers vary greatly. The training programs in place in the two agencies currently reflect those differences. Any effort to establish a single standard for both classes of officers would prove counter-productive.

A standard appropriate for CDC officers would require CYA to expend significant resources on training officers with weapons to which they have no access. In addition to generating unnecessary costs and diverting these officers from more useful training, such a standard might well undermine morale and policy. Training officers with weapons that policy prohibits from use sends a confusing and contradictory message. Alternatively, any standard designed for CYA would not prove adequate for CDC. Thus, the initial policy decision faced by CPOST is that of setting a meaningful standard that recognizes the difference between agencies. The following recommendations should all be viewed in this context.

In addition, we believe one additional issue should be addressed during policy deliberations. Although imposing a specified course of fire has been the traditional means to ensure firearm competency, this approach actually constrains the potential benefits of firearm training. While it assures an easily administered and defended universal standard, the mandated course, like all repetitive testing, hampers skill development.

Shootings occur in a wide variety of situations and require both specific motor skills and the application of reason and judgment. Repeatedly firing a single course encourages officers to fall into two habits detrimental to the improvement of their skills. They learn to maximize their performance by anticipating the course. More importantly, they cease to link cognition with action. The course becomes predictable and rote. Because time, range facilities, range staff and ammunition are all finite, constant repetition of the same course consumes resources to the exclusion of more innovative training.

The best firearm training results from alternating concentration on basic skill development with application on courses of fire that challenge the shooters to constantly apply these skills in new ways. This continuing need to adjust forces them to extend their skills and incorporate thinking with action. This sort of training has an additional benefit of making the training more interesting and challenging, thus avoiding boredom.

The following recommendations offer CPOST a number of alternative strategies to meet its legislative mandate to identify and approve standards for a course in the carrying and use of firearms for correctional peace officers that may be different than that prescribed for law enforcement and other personnel governed by the requirements specified in Penal Code Section 832. The recommendations are not listed in any order of preference. A summary of the recommendations can be found in Table 4.

➤ ***Recognize the current CDC training course for the 37/40mm as the CPOST standard.***

To impose a scored hit course of fire with these weapons would not be practical. The cost of ammunition and their limited accuracy preclude such a course. The current CDC program maintains familiarity with the operation of the weapon. With the development of reloadable ammunition, CDC has expanded its hands-on training. CDC has more experience with this weapon than any agency in the United States. Their firearm training staff has demonstrated a desire to maximize the quality of the training and innovate when costs allow them to do so. Although the weapon has the potential for producing serious injury, only one injury has apparently occurred. Thus we conclude that any effort by CPOST to impose a new qualification standard would serve little purpose.

➤ ***CPOST should not institute a standard for shotgun qualification and training.***

The shotgun has been almost entirely removed from the institutional setting by CDC. The uses that might occur relate to transportation and escape details. Since the shotgun is a firearm commonly used by peace officers throughout the state, there appears to exist no unique need for a separate correctional peace officer standard for this firearm. We recommend that CPOST defer to POST and CDC on the issue of shotgun training and

certification. The current CDC training equals or exceeds that of any other correctional agency and also meets the typical standard imposed by police agencies.

- ***CPOST should institute a minimum training and qualification standard for rifles that incorporates some requirement for simulation of actual firing conditions.***

For correctional officers working within institutions, the rifle constitutes the unique means of lethal force. Within institutions, virtually all fatal or serious injuries from firearms result from rifle fire. Yet, POST has imposed no rifle training and certification standard upon peace officers. Thus, the mandate for a CPOST standard to address requirements of correctional peace officers would seem to specifically apply here.

Most shootings involving rifles occur from elevated positions at ranges up to 100 yards. Shots fired from these elevated positions are frequently fired through narrow openings at relatively short distances. The current CDC rifle course addresses this issue with two exceptions. It does not require the shooter to fire from an elevated platform and it includes a kneeling position that appears impractical in the prison setting. Armed officers are normally in towers or internal gun positions that do not allow the officer to kneel and maintain a view through the window.

CPOST could prescribe a very specific course of fire for the currently used firearm, the Ruger Mini-14, which includes firing at least five rounds from an elevated tower. We recommend a course of action somewhat different from this. CPOST should draft a mandate that requires training and qualification with the rifle under conditions that reasonably simulate those under which officers will use the rifle and allow the highly competent staff at CDC to design the specific course(s) of fire. This approach would allow for changes in policy, facility design, and types of rifles used as well as course variation and innovation.

This recommendation does not address the frequency of certification or re-qualification. That issue is addressed in the following recommendation.

➤ ***CPOST should consider establishing a standard for frequency of firearm re-certification.***

Currently, CDC requires re-qualification of all correctional peace officers on all firearms yearly. In addition, CDC requires officers serving in armed posts or on other armed details to qualify quarterly with the weapons assigned to that post or detail. On occasion, officers without current quarterly qualification are pressed into service in an armed post or detail. This normally results from unexpected transportation demands or from a shortage of officers because of illness. Although this practice has not resulted in any serious liability issues, it has the potential for doing so.

CDC firearm training personnel were unanimous in the opinion that yearly training was inadequate. We agree that the yearly qualification is not adequate to assure currency of skills or maintenance of even minimal muscle memory. It does serve to maintain some familiarity and allow testing of minimum skill level. CPOST could address this issue in several alternative ways, none of which are ideal.

CPOST could mandate quarterly certification of all correctional peace officers on all firearms available for general issue. This would eliminate the risk of an officer being assigned to an armed detail without quarterly qualification. It would also generate substantial cost in training time, range resources, and lost opportunity for other training.

CPOST could also create a certification for armed correctional officers. Under this approach, only those officers holding a current certification could be assigned to armed duties. This would preclude officers without current quarterly certifications from being assigned to armed duties, with less cost imposed on CDC. It would likely require some increase in cost, however, as CDC would need to maintain a large enough pool of such officers to ensure that unexpected needs could be filled. It essentially creates two classes of officers and might generate resistance from a variety of sources.

The final option would be for CPOST to impose only a yearly qualification standard and allow CDC to continue its present program. The yearly qualification should not be

viewed as training but only as minimum certification of skills. CDC could facilitate the maintenance of those skills in a variety of ways, such as allowing voluntary use of ranges, simulation training, or quarterly training. This approach puts CPOST in a more limited role as certifying minimum competency through periodic testing rather than the active role of mandating training.

- ***CPOST consider establishing a requirement for simulation firearm training during the basic correctional officer training course and periodically thereafter.***

CDC has already launched their Range 2000 program. This training offers the potential for simulating circumstances faced by officers in ways that cannot be duplicated on the live fire range. We encourage CPOST to strongly consider mandating such training but allow CDC to determine the exact nature of the training. Simulation training is at the cutting edge of technology and innovation. It may eventually eliminate or nearly eliminate much of the need for live fire. By mandating such training, but in language that does not specify a particular course or technology, CPOST allows for constant innovation. As previously stated in relation to rifle training, the CPOST standard could call for training that simulates those conditions likely to be faced by officers in actual shooting situations.

- ***CDC should study the feasibility of opening their ranges regularly for both required training and voluntary additional training.***

Currently, officers are scheduled for specific range days and the ranges are closed at other times. By staffing ranges for specific days, CDC could allow officers who wish to improve their skills to make voluntary use of the range. In addition, many officers requiring quarterly or yearly qualification might schedule themselves during slack periods and eliminate the need for scheduling on the range.

- ***CDC should install elevated shooting platforms at all ranges.***

The reasons for this have already been addressed.

➤ ***CDC should vary the courses of fire for those officers firing quarterly.***

This could be accomplished either by allowing the staff at individual institutions to develop and implement their own courses, by providing multiple courses from which the range officers could choose at random, or by a rotation of courses specified by the academy staff for all institutions. The variety would not have to be infinite. The implementation of four separate courses would prevent course repetition within the year.

➤ ***CDC should examine the feasibility of introducing new technology into their academy and in-service training.***

The cutting edge technology currently in use at the FBI academy would undoubtedly improve the quality of firearm training conducted at the CDC basic academy. The large concentration of recruits and the existence of a regular firearm training staff would facilitate the use of this equipment. The primary barrier appears to be cost. Even if the cost proves prohibitive for general inclusion into the basic training at this time, it might be feasible to implement it on a limited basis to address problems with students experiencing difficulty. In addition, CDC should monitor the cost of such equipment as cost often declines as technology becomes more common. In addition, CDC should examine the most recent developments in simulated munitions to facilitate scenario-based training.

➤ ***Provide a range at the CDC academy site in Galt.***

Firearms training staff expressed almost universal agreement that cadets' failure to qualify with handguns or rifles may result from inadequate range time for recruits with no prior firearm experience and below average aptitude. A range at the CDC academy would allow more range time without lengthening the academy program. It would also facilitate additional remediation for cadets struggling with qualification. Currently, the use of a contract range requires that travel time to and from the range be taken from allowed firearm training time.

- ***For those CYA personnel authorized to carry and use handguns, we recommend that CPOST use a common standard for both CYA and CDC personnel.***

Although CPOST could develop a unique course of fire that differs from that imposed by POST, we do not recommend they do so. Regardless of CPOST actions, both agencies must continue to comply with the POST standard. The handgun training requirements for CDC and CYA personnel do not differ significantly from other peace officers. Thus, there appears to be no mandate for CPOST action. An additional CPOST mandated handgun course would increase training and certification costs by requiring two courses of fire. These resources would be better spent on agency-generated innovative training.

- ***Recognize current CYA training and familiarization standards for use of the 37mm weapon as adequate for Youth Correctional Officers.***

The current CYA training standards for the use of the 37mm weapon are adequate. The current training focuses largely on policy and handling familiarity. Because CYA is not currently authorized to use direct fire projectiles and the 37mm has only marginal accuracy, any effort to develop training focused on improved firing skill will meet with little success.

- ***CYA should investigate means for capitalizing on the extensive firearm training staff and resources possessed by CDC.***

CYA has no regular firearm training staff. They would likely benefit from contracting all their firearms training to CDC, which has a large and well-trained staff of instructors. At a minimum, CDC could provide training and certification for CYA instructors.

Table 4. Firearm Training Recommendations

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Course of Action</u>
Recognize the current CDC training course for the 37/40mm as the CPOST standard.	To impose a scored hit course of fire with these weapons would not be practical, due to the cost of ammunition and their limited accuracy. The current CDC program maintains familiarity with the operation of the weapon.
CPOST should not institute a standard for shotgun qualification and training.	CPOST should defer to POST and CDC on the issue of shotgun training and certification. The current CDC training equals or exceeds that of any other correctional agency and also meets the typical standard imposed by police agencies.
CPOST should institute a minimum training and qualification standard for rifles that incorporates some requirement for simulation of actual firing conditions.	Within institutions, virtually all fatal or serious injuries from firearms result from rifle fire. POST has imposed no rifle training and certification standard upon peace officers. CPOST should draft a mandate that requires training and qualification with the currently used firearm, the Ruger Mini-14, under conditions that reasonably simulate those under which officers will use the rifle and allow staff at CDC to design the specific course(s) of fire.
CPOST consider establishing a standard for frequency of firearm re-certification.	<p>Currently, CDC requires re-qualification of all correctional peace officers on all firearms yearly. In addition, CDC requires officers serving in armed posts or on other armed details to qualify quarterly with the weapons assigned to that post or detail. There are several alternatives open to CPOST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPOST could mandate quarterly certification of all correctional peace officers on all firearms available for general issue. This would eliminate the risk of an officer being assigned to an armed detail without quarterly qualification. It would also generate substantial cost in training time, range resources, and lost opportunity for other training. • CPOST could also create a certification for armed correctional officers, where only those officers holding a current certification could be assigned to armed duties. It would likely require some increase in cost and essentially creates two classes of officers, which may not be legally and politically feasible.
CPOST consider establishing a requirement for simulation firearm training during the basic correctional officer training course and periodically thereafter.	CDC has already launched their Range 2000 program. Simulation training is at the cutting edge of technology and innovation, and may eventually eliminate or nearly eliminate much of the need for live fire. CPOST is strongly encouraged to consider mandating such training but to allow CDC to determine the exact nature of the training.
CDC should study the feasibility of opening their ranges regularly for both required training and voluntary additional training.	Currently, officers are scheduled for specific range days and the ranges are closed at other times. CDC could allow officers who wish to improve their skills to make voluntary use of the range. In addition, many officers might voluntarily schedule themselves during slack periods.

Table 4. Firearm Training Recommendations

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Course of Action</u>
CDC should install elevated shooting platforms at all ranges.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Most shootings involving rifles occur from elevated positions at ranges up to 100 yards. Officers qualifying on rifles should practice from elevated platforms.
CDC should vary the courses of fire for those officers firing quarterly.	<p>This could be accomplished either by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allowing the staff at individual institutions to develop and implement their own courses;• Providing multiple courses from which the range officers could choose at random; or• Rotating courses specified by the academy staff for all institutions. <p>The implementation of four separate courses would prevent course repetition within the year.</p>
CDC should examine the feasibility of introducing new technology into their academy and in-service training.	<p>The cutting edge technology currently in use at the FBI academy would undoubtedly improve the quality of firearms training at the CDC basic academy. The large concentration of recruits and the existence of a regular firearm training staff would facilitate the use of this equipment. The primary barrier appears to be cost.</p>
Provide a range at the CDC academy site in Galt.	<p>Currently, the use of a contract range requires that travel time to and from the range be taken from allowed firearm training time. A range at the CDC academy would allow more range time without lengthening the academy program. It would also facilitate additional remediation for cadets struggling with qualification.</p>
For those CYA personnel authorized to carry and use handguns, we recommend that CPOST use a common standard for both CYA and CDC personnel.	<p>Although CPOST could develop a unique course of fire that differs from that imposed by POST, we do not recommend they do so. The handgun training requirements for CDC and CYA personnel do not differ significantly from other peace officers.</p>
Recognize current CYA training and familiarization standards for use of the 37mm weapon as adequate for Youth Correctional Officers.	<p>Because CYA is not currently authorized to use direct fire projectiles and the 37mm has only marginal accuracy, any effort to develop training focused on improved firing skill will meet with little success.</p>
CYA should investigate means for capitalizing on the extensive firearm training staff and resources possessed by CDC.	<p>Since CYA has no regular firearm training staff, they would likely benefit from contracting all their firearm training to CDC with its large and well-trained staff of instructors. At a minimum, CDC could provide training and certification for CYA instructors.</p>

CLOSING REMARKS

Current procedures possess the potential, though not the likelihood, for generating events that might create serious liability for the department. The use of officers without quarterly certification in armed posts or for armed escorts could result in one of those officers using deadly force. Although the likelihood of such an incident remains low, the ramifications could prove extreme.

Both liability claims and political attacks on the agency would gain significant credibility if CDC failed to meet its own training standard. This potential could be thwarted either by requiring all officers to qualify quarterly on all firearms or restricting armed assignments to officers certified quarterly. This restriction would raise questions regarding the rationality of yearly qualification for other officers since they could not use lethal firearms.

The department would have to train more officers than actually required on a regular basis to assure a reserve for illness and other unforeseen situations. This could well lead to three levels of firearm training for officers in institutions:

1. Officers assigned to tactical teams would receive advanced firearms training.
2. Officers authorized to work armed assignments would receive more routine regular firearm training.
3. All other officers would only receive in-service training on less-than-lethal weapons.

Removing a number of correctional peace officers from any possibility of assignment to armed functions raises potential personnel and political issues in an era when identification as peace officers appears to be a primary employee and union goal. The authority to carry firearms rivals arrest authority as a symbol of peace officer status in the United States. Officers and their representatives might well resist a three-tiered structure as discussed above because they see it as threatening their status, even though most officers do not work armed assignments.

Our firearm incident data described earlier indicated that between January 1998 and July 2001, officers' fired warning shots from rifles on 127 occasions and rifle shots for effect on 17 occasions. The 37/40mm firearms were used on 2381 occasions to fire non-lethal projectiles during this period but produced only one potentially serious injury and no fatal injuries. Although the 37/40mm clearly constitute the weapons most commonly used, the nature of the 37mm weapon precludes effective training for accuracy, as does the cost of ammunition. With the shift to the 40mm and the addition of a direct fire round, accuracy training will become possible, although the cost of ammunition remains a constraint. Once the transition to the 40mm has been made, officers should be provided more accurate training with this weapon. Such training should be phased in with adoption of the 40mm at each institution.

The current experiment with Range 2000 should continue, and this or some similar scenario-based training system requiring interpretation of events and use of judgment under stress should be implemented. Such alternative training would prove more useful than requiring officers to fire a standard qualification course more often than the present quarterly requirement. Standard qualification courses serve to maintain firearm familiarity and establish a base level of competency, but the marginal value of such training declines with its frequency. Officers tend to adapt to the course of fire rather than improving their skills.

Any increase in range time, such as monthly or bimonthly training, should not be devoted to increasing the frequency of qualification. Additional training days could be far more productive if they were devoted to innovate training that differed from the qualification courses. Every CDC range should have the capacity for elevated firing positions at the 100-yard line, and rifle qualification should include firing from the elevated position. If possible, simulated windows should be added to mirror the conditions of armed posts.

In closing, recognizing the organizational and political constraints that CPOST must confront as it approves standards for a course in the carrying and use of firearms for correctional peace officers, we recommend that any standard contain the following elements:

- Recognition of a realistic officer and agency firearm usage
- Commitment to outcome over pursuit of formalized process
- Support for commitment of limited resources to most productive outcomes
- Recognition and incorporation of existing agency strengths
- Allowance for innovative and adaptive training

APPENDICES

**California Department of Corrections
Firearm Training Survey of Range Masters**

The following information is being collected solely for the purpose of evaluating the nature of correctional peace officer firearm training needs and the availability of current resources for addressing these needs. This study does not address use of force policy, appropriateness of equipment, or any other topic beyond the specific scope of the study. General information developed on firearm training beyond that relevant to future CPOST standards will be made available to the Department of Corrections for any purpose they deem appropriate.

This form should be answered by the senior range master at the institution with input from the entire range staff.

Name of person completing form: _____

Institution: _____

Telephone number: _____

The following relate to firearm training facilities available to your institution.

Does your facility have a range? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, whose range facilities do you use? _____

What is the maximum range for rifle fire? _____ yards

Is there an elevated platform for rifle training? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Please describe any unique features at firing positions, such as windows or railings:

Please describe any unique features related to target areas, such as moving targets, obscured targets, etc.:

Are there any other unique range features you can describe:

Appendix 1

What is the maximum number of persons that the range can simultaneously accommodate for training the following firearms:

	Number
Revolver	_____
Rifle	_____
Rifle, elevated position	_____
Shotgun	_____
37 mm	_____

Have you developed and implemented any courses of fire in addition to those mandated for quarterly and yearly qualification?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe:

In your experience, are new correctional officers receiving adequate firearm training in the basic academy?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please comment:

Do you re-qualify new officers upon arrival at your institution? ☐ Yes ☐ No

What suggestions would you offer for changes in current firearm training and certification standards?

Table A1. Institutions Responding to Firearm Training Needs and Availability of Resources

Avenal State Prison
California Correctional Center
California Correctional Institution
California Institution for Women
California Medical Facility
California Men's Colony
California Rehabilitation Center
California State Prison, Centinela State Prison
California State Prison, Corcoran
California State Prison, Los Angeles County
California State Prison, Sacramento
California State Prison, Solano
California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility
Calipatria State Prison
Central California Women's Facility
Chuckawalla Valley State Prison
Correctional Training Facility, Soledad
Deuel Vocational Institution
Folsom State Prison
High Desert State Prison
Ironwood State Prison
Mule Creek State Prison
North Kern State Prison
Northern California Women's Facility
Pleasant Valley State Prison
R.J. Donovan Correctional Facility
Salinas Valley State Prison
Sierra Conservation Center
Valley State Prison for Women
Wasco State Prison

Note: Pelican Bay State Prison, California State Prison, San Quentin, and California Institution for Men did not return surveys

Table A2. Firearm Training Facility Availability and Characteristics by Institution

Institution	Firearms Training Range at Facility	Facility Range Shared With Other Agency/ Institution	Maximum Range	Elevated Platform for Rifle
Avenal State Prison (ASP)	Yes	Police	100	Yes
California Correctional Center (CCC)	No	HDSP	100/200 for SERT	Yes
California Correctional Institution (CCI)	Yes	Unknown	100	No
California Institution for Women (CIW)	No	CIM&CRC	100	No
California Medical Facility (CMF)	No	SOL	100	Yes
California Men's Colony (CMC)	No	National Guard	100	No
California Rehabilitation Center (CRC)	No	CIM	150	No
Centinela State Prison (CEN)	Yes	Unknown	200	Yes
California State Prison, Corcoran (COR)	Yes	SATF	100	Yes
California State Prison, Los Angeles County (LAC)	Yes	Police	100-200	Yes
California State Prison, Sacramento (SAC)	Yes	Unknown	100	No
California State Prison, Solano (SOL)	Yes	CMF	100	Yes
California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility (SATF)	No	COR	100	Yes
Calipatria State Prison (CAL)	Yes	Police	100-200	Yes
Central California Women's Facility (CCWF)	Yes	VSPW & Police	100	Yes
Chuckawalla Valley State Prison (CVSP)	Yes	ISP	200	Yes
Correctional Training Facility (CTF)	Yes	Unknown	100	No
Deuel Vocational Institution (DVI)	Yes	CTC	100	No
Folsom State Prison (FOL)	No	SAC	100	No
High Desert State Prison (HDSP)	Yes	CCC	100	Yes
Ironwood State Prison (ISP)	Yes	CVSP	100	Yes
Mule Creek State Prison (MCSP)	Yes	CTC	100-200	Yes
North Kern State Prison (NKSP)	Yes	CTC	100	Yes
Northern California Women's Facility (NCWF)	No	DVI	100	No
Pleasant Valley State Prison (PVSP)	Yes	Police	100	Yes
R.J. Donovan Correctional Facility (RJD)	Yes	Police	100	Yes
Salinas Valley State Prison (SVSP)	Yes	Unknown	100	Yes
Sierra Conservation Center	Yes	NCWF	100	No
Valley State Prison for Women	No	CCWF	100	Yes
Wasco State Prison	Yes	Unknown	200	Yes

Table A3. Maximum Number of Persons Simultaneously Accommodated for Training by Institution

Institution	<u>Maximum Simultaneous Persons Training With:</u>				
	Handgun	Rifle	Rifle- Elevation	Shotgun	37/40mm
Avenal State Prison	10	10+	10	10+	10+
California Correctional Center	14	16	16	14	16
California Correctional Institution	12	12	N/A	12	12
California Institution for Women	10	10	N/A	10	10
California Medical Facility	15	15	15	15	15
California Men's Colony	7	7	N/A	7	7
California Rehabilitation Center	10	10	10	10	10
Centinela State Prison	13	13	13	13	13
California State Prison, Corcoran	14	14	14	14	14
California State Prison, Los Angeles County	20	15	15	20	20
California State Prison, Sacramento	20	20	N/A	20	20
California State Prison, Solano	15	15	15	15	15
California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility	12	12	12	12	12
Calipatria State Prison	13	13	13	13	13
Central California Women's Facility	8	8	8	8	8
Chuckawalla Valley State Prison	10	10	10	10	10
Correctional Training Facility	10	10	N/A	10	10
Deuel Vocational Institution	20	20	N/A	20	20
Folsom State Prison	20	20	N/A	20	20
High Desert State Prison	14	15	15	14	14
Ironwood State Prison	10	10	10	10	10
Mule Creek State Prison	15	16	15	u	u
North Kern State Prison	14	14	14	14	14
Northern California Women's Facility	20	20	N/A	20	20
Pleasant Valley State Prison	15	15	15	15	15
R.J. Donovan Correctional Facility	18	18	18	18	18
Salinas Valley State Prison	19	19	16	19	19
Sierra Conservation Center	12	12	N/A	12	12
Valley State Prison for Women	8	8	8	8	8
Wasco State Prison	12	12	12	12	12

Table A4. Designated Firing Days, Days to Complete Quarterly Qualification, and Number of Qualified Range Personnel by Institution

Institution	Designated Firing Days	Days to Complete Quarterly Qualification	Number Qualified Range Personnel
Avenal State Prison	Yes	28	10
California Correctional Center	Yes	30	9
California Correctional Institution	Yes	28	14
California Institution for Women	Yes	28	15
California Medical Facility	Yes	28	8
California Men's Colony	Yes	28	20
California Rehabilitation Center	Yes	28	10
Centinela State Prison	Yes	28	14
California State Prison, Corcoran	Yes	27	6
California State Prison, Los Angeles County	Yes	28	14
California State Prison, Sacramento	Yes	27	10
California State Prison, Solano	Yes	28	10
California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility	Yes	28	11
Calipatria State Prison	Yes	28	15
Central California Women's Facility	Yes	28	8
Chuckawalla Valley State Prison	Yes	27	17
Correctional Training Facility	Yes	28	20
Deuel Vocational Institution	Yes	28	10
Folsom State Prison	Yes	28	9
High Desert State Prison	Yes	28	10
Ironwood State Prison	Yes	28	12
Mule Creek State Prison	Yes	28	6
North Kern State Prison	Yes	28	12
Northern California Women's Facility	Yes	28	5
Pleasant Valley State Prison	Yes	27	12
R.J. Donovan Correctional Facility	Yes	28	5
Salinas Valley State Prison	Yes	28	19
Sierra Conservation Center	Yes	28	17
Valley State Prison for Women	Yes	28	19
Wasco State Prison	Yes	7k	12



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

CENTER FOR HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

«Date»

«Name»

«Address»

Dear «Name»,

The Commission on Correctional Peace Officer Standards and Training (CPOST) is mandated to approve standards of training in the carrying and use of firearms for correctional peace officers. CPOST has contracted with the Center for Health and Human Services at California State University, Sacramento to review firearm training and certification standards applicable to correctional officers. As a part of this study, we are surveying correctional agencies to establish “best practices” as they now exist.

In that regard, we request that you send us a copy of the current regulations regarding recruit training and periodic subsequent certification for correctional peace officers in your state. If such information is available on the Internet, a direction to the appropriate web site would suffice.

Thank you in advance for any assistance you can provide us with this research project. If you have any questions, please contact me at 916.278.7048 or Professor Michael McCrystle at 916.278.6387. I can also be reached at vizzard@csus.edu.

Sincerely yours,

William J. Vizzard
Professor, Criminal Justice Division

Table B1. States Providing Recruit Training and Periodic Certification for Correctional Officers

Arizona	New Jersey
California	New Mexico
Colorado	New York
Florida	North Dakota
Georgia	Oklahoma
Illinois	Oregon
Iowa	Rhode Island
Kansas	South Carolina
Kentucky	Tennessee
Louisiana	Texas
Massachusetts	Utah
Michigan	Vermont
Minnesota	Washington
Montana	West Virginia
Nebraska	

Table B2. Firearm Certification and Recertification Interval by State

State	POST/CPOST or Equivalent Certified	Recertify Interval
Arizona	Yes	Annual
California	Yes	N/A
Colorado	Yes ¹	Annual
Florida	Yes	Annual
Georgia	Yes	Biannual
Illinois	Yes ¹	Annual
Iowa	Yes	Annual
Kansas	N/A	Annual
Kentucky	N/A	Annual
Louisiana	Yes	Annual
Massachusetts	N/A	Annual
Michigan	No	N/A
Minnesota	N/A	Annual
Montana	N/A	Annual
Nebraska	No	Annual
New Jersey	Yes	Annual
New Mexico	Yes	Annual
New York	Yes	N/A
Oregon	No	N/A
Rhode Island	Yes	Annual
South Carolina	Yes	Annual
Tennessee	N/A	Annual
Texas	No	N/A
Utah	N/A	Annual
Vermont	Same	Annual
West Virginia	N/A	Annual

¹Peace Officers are POST certified but Correctional Officers are not.

Table B3. Correctional Officers' Initial Firearm Qualification by State

State	<u>Initial Qualification</u>			
	Handgun	Rifle	Shotgun	Large Bore
Arizona	Service Handgun		12-gauge	37mm
Colorado	None	Rifle	Shotgun	
Georgia	.38	.223	12-gauge	
Illinois	.38	.223 & 30/06	12-gauge	
Iowa	Revolver	Rifle	Shotgun	
Kansas	Pistol	Rifle	Shotgun	
Kentucky	.38	.223	12-gauge	(a)
Louisiana	Pistol (b)	Rifle (b)	Shotgun (b)	(b)
Massachusetts	.38	.223	12-gauge	
Montana	.357	.223	12-gauge	
Nebraska	None	Rifle	Shotgun	
New Mexico	Handgun	Rifle	Shotgun	37mm(c)
New York	.38	.223	12-gauge	38mm(c)
Oregon	.38	.223	12-gauge	
Rhode Island	.38	.223	12-gauge	
Tennessee	.38	.223	12-gauge	
Texas	Pistol	Rifle	Shotgun	
Utah	Pistol	.223	Shotgun	
West Virginia	.40	.223	12-gauge	37mm

(a) Chemical delivery method is not specified

(b) Too many specific types are allowed to list

(c) Requalification cycle is unclear